UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,036	07/12/2001	Jonathan J. Hull	015358-006000US	2402

20350	7590	11/01/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
BLACK, LINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the Applicants' Arguments dated 8/14/2006.

Claims 1-44 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 15, 28-29, and 42 are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Ferguson et al. (US 6820094).

As per claim 1, Ferguson et al. teach

identifying **at least** a first section of the first document; extracting a first set of one or

more information objects from the first section of the first document, the first set of

information objects comprising at least a first information object comprising information

of a first type, wherein the first information object **is one of** an audio object, a video

object, or an image object – col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 29 (indexes, categorizes and

stores a wide range of document types...extracting attribute data from the document;

and generating a data structure for the document, the data structure contains the

attribute data in a standardized format...); col. 3, lines 21-44 (document containing

graphical image data); col. 6, lines 25-32; col. 8, lines 22-44 (extract category criteria

(i.e., the key words and/or attributes)).

processing information objects in the first set of information objects and information

objects in a second set of information objects to determine a degree of relevancy

information indicating the relevancy of information objects in the second set of

information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects, wherein

the second set of information objects comprises at least one information object

comprising information of a second type, wherein the second type is different from the

first type, and wherein determining the degree of relevancy information comprises

determining a degree of relevancy of the at least one information object to the first

information object from the first set of information objects – col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line

3; col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 29 (text object from the first document – second type –

text is different from image, the first data type); col. 8, lines 22-44; col. 13, line 52 to col.

14, line 10; table 1 – col. 19 (relevance scores).

selecting a third set of one or more information objects from information objects in the

second set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information

determined for information objects in the second set of information objects, wherein

information objects in the third set of information objects store information to be output

to the user when the first document is being displayed to the user – col. 11, lines 55-65;

col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 17.

As per claim 2, Ferguson et al. teach

wherein the first section of the first document corresponds to a section of the first

document displayed to the user, wherein the section of the first document displayed to

the user is less than the entire first document – col. 5, lines 45-40; col. 7, lines 22-47;

col. 11, lines 22-35.

As per claim 3, Ferguson et al. teach

wherein the first section of the first document corresponds to the entire first document –

col. 14, line 63 to col. 15, line 29.

As per claim 4, Ferguson et al. teach

for each information object in the first set of information objects: identifying a type of the

information object based upon contents of the information object; determining a first

content recognition technique based upon the type of the information object; applying

the first content recognition technique to the information object to determine information

related to the contents of the information object – col. 4, lines 24-28.

Ferguson et al.'s teaching can extract information/content attributes from digital

objects and categorize digital objects of different types (shown in claim 1), thus, it is

inherent that Ferguson et al.'s teaching including appropriate technique to extract information from objects and to categorize objects accordingly.

As per claim 5, Ferguson et al. teach determining the degree of relevancy information for different types of objects – col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line 3; col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 6; col. 8, lines 22-44; col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 10; table 1 – col. 19 (relevance scores). Thus, it is inherent that Ferguson's teaching have techniques to generate the relevancy scores for each different types of objects. Ferguson et al. teach displaying the most relevant result set to the users – col. 13, lines 52-67.

As per claims 6-7, Ferguson et al. teach calculating the degree/level of relevancies - col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line 3; col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 6; col. 8, lines 22-44; col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 10; table 1 – col. 19 (relevance scores above a threshold value). Ferguson et al. teach determining the type of objects – col. 4, lines 24-28; extracting information from objects - – col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 29; col. 6, lines 25-32; col. 8, lines 22-44. Ferguson et al.'s teaching can extract information/content attributes from digital objects and categorize digital objects of different types (shown in claim 1), thus, it is inherent that Ferguson et al.'s teaching including appropriate technique to extract information from objects and to categorize objects accordingly.

As per claims 8-9, Ferguson et al. teach

determining a set of one or more concepts of interest to the user – col. 5, lines 15-40.

Ferguson et al. teach different document types' content information are extracted and

used to categorize the documents – col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 29; col. 6, lines 25-32;

col. 8, lines 22-44. Ferguson et al. teach calculating the degree/level of relevancies for

documents/files - col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line 3; col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 6; col. 8,

lines 22-44; col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 10; table 1 – col. 19 (relevance scores above

a threshold value); identifying the type of the objects – col. 4, lines 24-28. Thus, it is

inherent that Ferguson et al. teach the comparison technique that allows the

comparison between different types of objects for calculating the relevancy scores.

As per claim 10, Ferguson et al. teach

wherein information objects in the third set of information objects store information to be

output to the user when the first document is being displayed to the user – col. 11, lines

55-65; col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 17.

(the third set of objects to be displayed to users is the most relevant documents that

meet the criteria set forth above – col. 13, line 51 to col. 14, line 10).

As per claims 11-12, Ferguson et al. teach a web browser and a web page – col. 6,

lines 37-67; col. 11, line 20 to col. 12, line 15.

As per claim 13, Ferguson et al. teach displaying document based on the relevancy –

col. 13, line 25 to col. 14, line 25; a portion of the relevant document can be displayed –

col. 5, lines 15-40; col. 7, line 33 to col. 8, line 21; automatically determining the

relevancy of documents/objects and portions of objects - col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line 3;

col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 6; col. 8, lines 22-44; col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 10; table

1 – col. 19 (relevance scores above a threshold value). Thus, as portions of

documents/objects are categorized based on the relevancy, the most relevant object(s)

will be displayed to users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ferguson et al. (US 6820094), and further in view of Herz (US 6460036).

As per claim 14, Ferguson et al. teach

identifying **at least** a first section of the first document; extracting a first set of one or

more information objects from the first section of the first document, the first set of

information objects comprising at least a first information object comprising information

of a first type, wherein the first information object **is one of** an audio object, a video

object, or an image object – col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 29 (indexes, categorizes and

stores a wide range of document types... extracting attribute data from the document;

and generating a data structure for the document, the data structure contains the

attribute data in a standardized format...); col. 3, lines 21-44 (document containing

graphical image data); col. 6, lines 25-32; col. 8, lines 22-44 (extract category criteria

(i.e., the key words and/or attributes); .

processing information objects in the first set of information objects and information

objects in a second set of information objects to determine a degree of relevancy

information indicating the relevancy of information objects in the second set of

information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects, wherein

the second set of information objects comprises at least one information object

comprising information of a second type, wherein the second type is different from the

first type, and wherein determining the degree of relevancy information comprises

determining a degree of relevancy of the at least one information object to the first

information object from the first set of information objects – col. 1, line 64 to col. 4, line

3; col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 29 (text object from the first document – second type –

text is different from image, the first data type); col. 8, lines 22-44 (score and rank the

relevancy); col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 10 (level of relevance); table 1 – col. 19

(relevance scores).

selecting a third set of one or more information objects from information objects in the

second set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information

determined for information objects in the second set of information objects, wherein

information objects in the third set of information objects store information to be output

to the user when the first document is being displayed to the user – col. 11, lines 55-65;

col. 13, line 52 to col. 14, line 17.

However, Ferguson et al. do not explicitly suggest that first object(s) are of the

content providers'. Herz teaches system and method for providing customized

electronic newspapers and target advertisements – the title; retrieve new document

from document store; calculate document profiles, cluster documents into a hierachical

cluster; generate labels for each cluster – fig. 5; col. 56, lines 30-67; relevance weight –

fig. 12; network vendor/ provider – fig. 16; col. 31, lines 35-47. Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

Ferguson et al.'s teaching and Herz's teaching in order to determine the relevancy of

content providers' documents comparing to users' interaction/view file to better provide

users the most desired or relevant search results.

Claims 15-44 claim the same subject matter as of claim 11-14 are rejected based on the

same ground of rejection.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-44 have been considered but are

not persuasive. Regarding the Applicants' argument on page 23 first paragraph that

Ferguson is silent as to how the level of relevance is associated with category criteria,

thus, does not teach nor suggest "processing information objects in the first set of information objects and information objects in a second set of information objects to determine a degree fo relevancy information", Examiner disagrees. The first set of ONE or more information objects is extracted and categorized based on the relevancy, also for the second set of ONE or more objects as showed in columns and line above.

Regarding the Applicants' argument that Furguson fails to teach the limitation "selecting a third set of **ONE** or more information objects from information objects in the second set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information determined for information objects in the second set of information objects, wherein information objects in the third set of information objects store information to be output to the user when the first document is being displayed to the user", Examiner disagrees. Based on the level of relevancy of at least one of the second document type objects after the user's search query, the user can view the identified documents as small icons, large icons, thumbnails or as a detailed list of documents which Examiner interprets as the third set of ONE or more information to be output to the user – col. 13, lines 40-67 in which each of the one or more smart folders has category criteria associated with a particular level of relevance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH BLACK whose telephone number is 571-272-4106. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LINH BLACK
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

April 3, 2006

Leslie Wong
Primary Examiner